



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/635,624	08/10/2000	Paul A. Firestone		5848

7590 08/22/2002

Paul A Firestone  
88 Central Park West  
New York, NY 10023

EXAMINER

FRANKLIN, JAMARA ALZAIDA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 08/22/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/635,624	FIRESTONE, PAUL A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jamara A. Franklin	2876	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 May 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/2/02 has been entered.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Urbish et al. (US 5,734,343) (hereinafter referred to as 'Urbish') in view of Leitner et al. (US 5,587,575) (hereinafter referred to as 'Leitner').

Urbish teaches a way to eliminate the tollbooth by eliminating the need for vehicles to slow or stop and deposit toll payments at the toll booth (col. 4, lines 46-58). A plurality of labels 15 are affixed in a variety of different locations on a vehicle 10 (col. 2, lines 45-51). The label contains information of a fixed nature, for example, the vehicle identification number, in a coded form. Bar codes have been found to be the label which is most machine readable, however, icons and alphanumeric text are also quite readable and may be used effectively.

Art Unit: 2876

These various types may be used singly or in combination in the identification label (col. 3, lines 39-51). A detector 25 is used to pick up information (including identification number) about the vehicle 10 that is read from the label 15 as the vehicle and label pass under a light source 20.

The identification number is then used to assess tolls on the vehicle as it passes a certain location (col. 4, lines 10-29).

Urbish lacks the teaching of moving readers.

Leitner teaches portable readers for use by police or traffic officials to scan a code that has been attached to a vehicle (col. 3, lines 18-20 and lines 60-62).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that moving the reader in conjunction to the code would have been beneficial to the invention of Urbish for allowing the code to be read in a variety of conditions and situations including a case where the vehicle to which the code is affixed is located in an area not equipped for a fixed reader. Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Urbish with the moving reader as taught by Leitner.

4. Claims 4, 5, 8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Urbish in view of Slavin et al. (US 5,819,234) (herein after referred to as 'Slavin'). The teachings of Urbish have been discussed above.

Urbish lacks the specific teaching of establishing an account with the identification code at a central agency and transferring data containing the identification code from the reader to the central agency.

Art Unit: 2876

Slavin teaches an account corresponding to a transponder 30 and unique tag number for charging toll. The account is established at a Customer Service Center 72 (col. 5, lines 53-60).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that establishing an account to be charged against would have been beneficial to the invention of Urbish since an account could have served as a established source for recording the charges made against the vehicle to which the account is associated. Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Urbish with the aforementioned teachings of Slavin to help maintain a history of tolls collected.

5. Claims 6, 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Urbish/Slavin as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Leitner et al. (US 5,587,575) (hereinafter referred to as 'Leitner'). The teachings of Urbish/Slavin have been discussed above.

Urbish/Slavin lack the teaching of moving readers.

Leitner teaches portable readers for use by police or traffic officials to scan a code that has been attached to a vehicle (col. 3, lines 18-20 and lines 60-62).

Again, one of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that moving the reader in conjunction to the code would have been beneficial to the invention of Urbish/Slavin for allowing the code to be read in a variety of conditions and situations including a case where the vehicle to which the code is affixed is located in an area not equipped for a fixed reader. Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Urbish/Slavin with the moving reader as taught by Leitner.

Art Unit: 2876

*Response to Arguments*


6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The new grounds of rejection has been used to overcome the argument that the previous rejection does not teach passive devices.

*Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jamara A. Franklin whose telephone number is (703) 305-0128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703)308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

  
Jamara A. Franklin  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2876

JAF  
August 15, 2002

  
MICHAEL G. LEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800